

10-04-05

IFW

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
In re Application control number 10/642,570
Applicant Curtis N. Knowles
Attention: Examiner Frankie L. Stinson, Art Unit 1746


The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 2, all the claims in the application as anticipated by either Engel or Koyama under 35 USC 102(b). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn in view of the following remarks. Each of these patents teach the provision of arrangements for coupling paint rollers to electric drills in order to clean them by spinning and throwing off residual liquid by centrifugal force, as does Applicant. However, neither patent even remotely suggests the specific structure utilized for coupling the paint roller to the drill as utilized by Applicant and specifically set forth in Applicant's claims. Applicant's base claim 1 sets forth protrusions mounted on a shaft which are located from the first end of the shaft a distance greater than the length of the roller cover support means and a compressing means to in affect cause the roller cover support means to be gripped between it and the protrusion means. This arrangement enables a convenient method of coupling the more commonly used "cage type" roller to the drill, but also permits the same tool to be used with roller cages or support means with various lengths interchangeably. Neither Engel or Koyama teach the gripping of the roller support means between a compressing means at the end of the shaft and a protrusion means spaced from the end of the shaft a distance greater than the length of the roller cover support means. This language is specifically set forth in Applicant's claims, and cannot be ignored. The patentee's don't disclose any compressing means or protrusion means at all, nor do they specify any spacing of these two elements with respect to the length of the roller cover support means. It is this feature that enables Applicant's tool to be successfully used interchangeably with roller cages of various conventional sizes, i.e; 7 in. 9 in. etc.

Dependent claim 2 is allowable for the same reasons as its base claim 1 and it further includes a guide sleeve loosely mounted on the shaft so that one hand can hold the drill and the other hand grip the guide sleeve in order to maintain proper control of the tool in operation. Neither Engel or Koyama teach any form of such a guide sleeve.

In summary, Applicant has provided a tool for easily and conveniently coupling a cage type roller to a hand held drill which will easily accommodate roller cages of various lengths interchangeably. This specific structure is set forth in the claims and is not found in any of the references cited by the Examiner.

Since there are no other formal requirements outstanding, an early and favorable resolution is respectfully solicited. The other references cited by the Examiner have been reviewed but do not disclose the claimed structure either.

Respectfully submitted,


Curtis N. Knowles